



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,337	01/29/2001	Glenn Ricart	300 / 4	8685
27538	7590	11/05/2003	EXAMINER	
KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P. 900 ROUTE 9 NORTH WOODBIDGE, NJ 07095			BRAGDON, REGINALD GLENWOOD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	4

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/772,337

Applicant(s)

RICART ET AL.

Examiner

Reginald G. Bragdon

Art Unit

2188

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings filed on 29 January 2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 9, line 4, "to a" should just be --a---.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Midgley et al. (6,526,418).

As per claims 7 and 9, Midgley et al. teaches, with reference to figure 1, a network 10 (where the network could be the Internet; see column 8, lines 19-23; "means for providing access to a wide area network..."), including a server for storing email 18 ("access server"; see column 7, lines 23-26) and a back-up server 12 (see column 7, lines 8-9; "means for backing up data...").

Art Unit: 2188

Midgley et al. also teaches a client 28 (“subscriber server” or “means for connecting [a] subscriber server...”).

As per claim 8, Midgley et al. teaches that the server 18 stores email. See column 7, lines 23-26.

5. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anglin (6,026,414).

As per claims 7 and 9, Anglin teaches, with reference to figure 1, a system including a network (where the network could be the Internet; see column 3, lines 64-65), a file server 8 (“access server”) and a backup server 6. Anglin also teaches a client 4, which includes a program 18 for performing backups with the backup server. See column 5, lines 20-22.

As per claim 8, Anglin teaches that the server is a file server (“FTP”).

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cane et al. (US 2002/0129047).

As per claims 1, 11, and 12, Cane et al. teaches a multiple copy file backup system in a client (“subscriber server”) and server (“service provider access server”) environment. With reference to figure 1-A, in step 102, the server receives a unique user ID desiring to backup the contents of a file, wherein a file represents a “data increment” (“identifying at least one data increment...”). See paragraph [0033]. The server then checks to see if the file identifier is present in the file data table, wherein if the file identifier is located in the file data table then a copy of the file already exists at the server location (“checking at least one service provider access server to determine if it has a copy of at least a portion of the identified data increment...”). See steps 110 and 112 and paragraph [0033]. If the server contains a copy of the

Art Unit: 2188

file, then a copy of the file is made on the back-up system (“backing up the data increment using the copy...”). See figure 1-C, step 130 and paragraph [0034]. If the server does not contain a copy of the file, then the client provides a copy of the file to the server (“...otherwise using a copy sent from the subscriber server after the checking step”). See figure 1-D.

As per claim 2, Cane et al. teaches, in step 102, using the File ID and User Name (“source address”) to identify the file (“evaluating one of...source address...at the subscriber server”). Inherently, in step 130, the File ID must be sent to back-up server when making the copy of the file.

As per claims 3 and 6, Cane et al. teaches that the file backup storage system may be on another server than the server 204. See paragraph [0022].

As per claim 5, if a copy is sent from the client (figure 1-D), then no backup of the file is performed (i.e. delayed for a time period) until a second request for the file is made that results in the need to backup the file (e.g. figure 1-C).

As per claim 10, Cane et al. teaches a File ID (“data increment identifier”). See figure 1-A. Cane et al. also teaches indicating whether a copy of the file is found on the server (see figure 1-A, steps 110 and 112), and inherently indicates that such a copy is found on the server.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2188

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cane et al. in view of Beeler, Jr. (5,974,563).

As per claim 4, Cane et al. does not teach computing a checksum to determine if the server has the same copy of the file the client has. Beeler, Jr. teaches calculating and comparing the checksums of each block of a file between a source and target such that only blocks that are different between the source and target are transmitted over the network. See column 15, lines 53-61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Cane et al. to calculate and then compare checksums, as suggested by Beeler, Jr., because this would significantly reduce the amount of network traffic. See column 15, lines 61-64.

### *Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cannon et al. (6,615,225) teaches client computers connected over a network to a back-up server.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

All "OFFICIAL" patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX must be directed to the central FAX number at (703) 872-9306:

"INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" FAX communications may be sent to the Examiner at (703) 746-5693, only after approval by the Examiner.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121  
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Art Unit: 2188

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald G. Bragdon whose telephone number is (703) 305-3823. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM and every other Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM.

The examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan, can be reached at (703) 306-2903.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

RGB  
October 31, 2003

*Reginald G. Bragdon*  
Reginald G. Bragdon  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2188